

A Proof of Exact Convergence Rate of Gradient Descent.

Part I. Performance Criterion $\|\nabla f(x_N)\|^2/(f(x_0) - f_*)$

Jungbin Kim

Abstract

We prove the exact worst-case convergence rate of gradient descent for smooth strongly convex optimization, with respect to the performance criterion $\|\nabla f(x_N)\|^2/(f(x_0) - f_*)$. The proof differs from the previous one by Rotaru *et al.* [RGP24], and is based on the performance estimation methodology [DT14].

1 Introduction

Consider the optimization problem

$$x_* \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x), \quad (1)$$

where f is in $\mathcal{F}_{\mu,L}$, the space of L -smooth and μ -strongly convex functions on \mathbb{R}^d . Consider the gradient descent method

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \gamma \nabla f(x_k) \quad (\text{GD})$$

with a constant stepsize $\gamma \in (0, 2/L)$. Given the number N of iterations, the *convergence rate*, or *worst-case performance*, of GD is defined as follows:

$$\sup \left\{ \frac{\|\nabla f(x_N)\|^2}{f(x_0) - f(x_*)} : f \in \mathcal{F}_{\mu,L}, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, x_k \text{ generated by GD} \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where the performance criterion is set as $\|\nabla f(x_N)\|^2/(f(x_0) - f_*)$. Recently, Rotaru *et al.* proved the exact value of (2) by showing the following result.

Theorem 1 ([RGP24, Thm. 2.2, Prop. 5.2]). *The iterates of GD satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f(x_N)\|^2 \leq \max \left\{ \frac{\kappa}{(\kappa - 1) + (1 - \gamma\mu)^{-2N}}, (1 - \gamma L)^{2N} \right\} (f(x_0) - f(x_*)), \quad (3)$$

where $\kappa = \mu/L$. Moreover, this convergence guarantee is tight.

Note that the statement of Theorem 1 consists of two parts: the first part claims an upper bound of (2), while the second part claims a lower bound of (2). In this paper, we provide a proof of the first part (upper bound), which differs from the one in [RGP24]. The proof is done by taking a weighted sum of the interpolation inequalities (7) at the indices

$$(i, j) \in \{(k, k+1), (k+1, k), (N, k)\}_{0 \leq k \leq N-1} \cup \{(N, *)\}. \quad (4)$$

Our choice of inequalities differs from the one in [RGP24] and shares some similarities with the one used in the analysis of OGM-G in [KF21], as well as the one used in the analysis of GD in [TB19]. See below for a comparison.

$$\begin{aligned}
(i, j) &\in \{(k, k+1), (k+1, k)\}_{0 \leq k \leq N-1} \cup \{(k, k+2), (k+2, k)\}_{0 \leq k \leq N-2} \cup \{(N, *)\} & \text{[RGP24]} \\
(i, j) &\in \{(k, k+1), (N, k)\}_{0 \leq k \leq N-1} \cup \{(N, *)\} & \text{[KF21]} \\
(i, j) &\in \{(k, k+1), (k+1, k), (*, k)\}_{0 \leq k \leq N-1} & \text{[TB19]}
\end{aligned}$$

1.1 Preliminaries and notations

We follow the notations in [RGP24]. A differentiable function f is L -smooth if

$$0 \leq f(p) - f(q) + \langle \nabla f(p), q - p \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|p - q\|^2$$

for all $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^d$. A differentiable function f is μ -strongly convex if

$$0 \geq f(p) - f(q) + \langle \nabla f(p), q - p \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|p - q\|^2$$

for all $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Throughout this paper, we allow $\mu < 0$. The inverse condition number μ/L is denoted by κ . We define $\rho = 1 - \gamma L$ and $\eta = 1 - \gamma\mu$. We define the following functions:

$$\begin{aligned}
E_k(x) &= \sum_{j=1}^{2k} x^{-j} \\
F_k(x) &= \sum_{j=1}^k x^j \\
T_k(\rho, \eta) &= E_k(\eta) - E_k(\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

We denote $f_k = f(x_k)$, $g_k = \nabla f(x_k)$, $x_k^+ = x_k - \frac{1}{L} \nabla f(x_k)$, and $f_k^+ = f(x_k) - \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f(x_k)\|^2$. The term *stepsize* may refer to either $\gamma \in (0, 2/L)$ or the normalized one $\gamma L \in (0, 2)$.

2 Performance estimation problem with basis $\{x_{k+1}^+ - x_k^+\}$

A performance estimation problem (PEP) [DT14] is an optimization problem which converts the task of proving a convergence guarantee into the task of verifying the positive semi-definiteness of a specific matrix. In this section, we present a variant of PEP, designed for the performance criterion $\|\nabla f(x_N)\|^2 / (f(x_0) - f_*)$. Our PEP differs from the one in [KF21], which is tailored for the same performance criterion, in the sense that we use $\{x_{k+1}^+ - x_k^+\}$ as the basis for the quadratic form, while they use $\{g_k\}$ as the basis. For simplicity, we derive the result without formulating the PEP as an optimization problem. The readers who seek a more concrete approach may consider reading this section together with [DT14, §4; THG17, §3].

2.1 H-matrix representation of first-order methods

Consider first-order methods where each iterate x_{k+1} is in the span of $\{\nabla f(x_0), \dots, \nabla f(x_k)\}$. For such methods, there is an $N \times N$ lower-triangular matrix \mathbf{H} such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 - x_0 \\ \vdots \\ x_N - x_{N-1} \end{bmatrix} = -\frac{1}{L} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_{1,1} & & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \\ \mathbf{H}_{N,1} & \cdots & \mathbf{H}_{N,N} & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(x_0) \\ \vdots \\ \nabla f(x_{N-1}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

For example, GD can be expressed in the form of (5) by setting $\mathbf{H} = (\gamma L)I_N$, where I_N is the identity matrix. We reparametrize (5) so that the iterates appeared on the left-hand side become x_k^+ instead of x_k . Define $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{g} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{N+1}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{H}} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1) \times (N+1)}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} x_0^+ - x_0 \\ x_1^+ - x_0^+ \\ \vdots \\ x_{N-1}^+ - x_{N-2}^+ \\ x_N^+ - x_{N-1}^+ \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{H}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & & \\ \mathbf{H}_{1,1} - 1 & 1 & & & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & & \\ \mathbf{H}_{N-1,1} & \mathbf{H}_{N-1,2} & \cdots & & 1 & \\ \mathbf{H}_{N,1} & \mathbf{H}_{N,2} & \cdots & \mathbf{H}_{N,N} - 1 & 1 & \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{g} = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(x_0) \\ \nabla f(x_1) \\ \vdots \\ \nabla f(x_{N-1}) \\ \nabla f(x_N) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, the algorithm (5) can be equivalently written as $\mathbf{x} = -\frac{1}{L}\tilde{\mathbf{H}}\mathbf{g}$.

2.2 Quadratic reformulation

Recall that a differentiable function f is in $\mathcal{F}_{\mu,L}$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq f(p) - f(q) + \langle \nabla f(p), q - p \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f(p) - \nabla f(q)\|^2 + \frac{\mu L}{2(L-\mu)} \left\| p - q - \frac{1}{L} (\nabla f(p) - \nabla f(q)) \right\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

holds for all $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$. Using the notations in Section 1.1, we can rewrite (6) with $p = x_j$ and $q = x_i$, where $i, j \in \{0, \dots, N, *\}$, as follows:

$$0 \geq Q_{i,j} := f_j^+ - f_i^+ + \langle g_j, x_i^+ - x_j^+ \rangle + \frac{\mu L}{2(L-\mu)} \|x_i^+ - x_j^+\|^2. \quad (7)$$

Our goal is to prove the following inequality with some positive constant τ :

$$\frac{1}{2\tau} \|g_N\|^2 \leq f_0 - f_N^+. \quad (8)$$

From (8), we can obtain an upper bound 2τ of $\|g_N\|^2 / (f_0 - f_*)$ by adding the inequality $0 \leq f_N^+ - f_*$.² We can exclude the index $*$ since the point x_* is involved in the proof only through the inequality (7) with $(i, j) = (N, *)$, which will be incorporated after showing (8). Denote the index set as $I = \{0, \dots, N\}$. To prove (8), it suffices to show that the inequality

$$0 \leq S := f_0^+ - f_N^+ + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_0\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\tau} \|g_N\|^2 + \sum_{i,j \in I} \lambda_{i,j} Q_{i,j} \quad (9)$$

holds with some non-negative constants $\lambda_{i,j}$. We refer to τ and $\lambda_{i,j}$ as multipliers. One can observe that S depends linearly on $\{f_k^+\}$, and quadratically on $\{g_k\}$ and $\{x_k^+\}$. We further restrict the proof strategy by limiting ourselves to only use a specific subset of the interpolation inequalities (7). Specifically, we allow $\lambda_{i,j} \neq 0$ only for the indices in (4). Our strategy for showing (9) is clear: we will show that

¹See, for example, [Nes18, Thm. 2.1.5] for the case where $\mu = 0$. For the general case where $\mu \in (-\infty, L)$, one can prove this by applying (6) with $\mu = 0$ to the function $f(x) - \frac{\mu}{2}\|x\|^2$, which is convex and $(L - \mu)$ -smooth.

²This inequality is valid for any $\mu \in (-\infty, L)$, but is implied by the interpolation inequality (7) with $(i, j) = (N, *)$ only when $\mu \in [0, L)$.

- (i) The linear terms in S vanishes.
- (ii) The sum of the quadratic terms in S is non-negative everywhere.

In the next subsection, we express these conditions explicitly.

2.3 Semi-definite reformulation

It is straightforward to see that (i) is equivalent to the following condition:

$$\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_{i,k} - \sum_{j \in I} \lambda_{k,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = N \\ -1 & \text{if } k = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

We now derive a necessary and sufficient condition for (ii). Define two $(N+1) \times (N+1)$ matrices as follows:

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & b_0 & c_0 & c_0 & \cdots & c_0 & c_0 \\ 0 & a_1 & b_1 & c_1 & \cdots & c_1 & c_1 \\ 0 & 0 & a_2 & b_2 & \cdots & c_2 & c_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a_3 & \cdots & c_3 & c_3 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_{N-1} & b_{N-1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & a_N \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d_1 & e_1 & e_1 & \cdots & e_1 & e_1 \\ 0 & e_1 & d_2 & e_2 & \cdots & e_2 & e_2 \\ 0 & e_1 & e_2 & d_3 & \cdots & e_3 & e_3 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & e_1 & e_2 & e_3 & \cdots & d_{N-1} & e_{N-1} \\ 0 & e_1 & e_2 & e_3 & \cdots & e_{N-1} & d_N \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_k &= \lambda_{k-1,k} \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, N \\ b_k &= \begin{cases} -\lambda_{k+1,k} - \lambda_{N,k} & \text{if } k \leq N-2 \\ -\lambda_{N,N-1} & \text{if } k = N-1 \end{cases} \\ c_k &= -\lambda_{N,k} \text{ for } k = 0, \dots, N-2 \\ d_k &= \begin{cases} \lambda_{k-1,k} + \lambda_{k,k-1} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \lambda_{N,j} & \text{if } k \leq N-1 \\ \lambda_{N-1,N} + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \lambda_{N,j} & \text{if } k = N \end{cases} \\ e_k &= \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \lambda_{N,j} \text{ for } k = 0, \dots, N-1. \end{aligned}$$

Then, one can check that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j \in I} \lambda_{ij} \langle g_j, x_i^+ - x_j^+ \rangle &= -\langle \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Ax} \rangle \\ \sum_{i,j \in I} \lambda_{ij} \|x_i^+ - x_j^+\|^2 &= \langle \mathbf{Bx}, \mathbf{x} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

x	-1	\dots	0	\dots	∞
$E_k(x)$	0	\nearrow	∞	\searrow	0

Table 1: The behavior of the function E_k for any fixed k .

Thus, when the terms f_k^+ vanish, using $\mathbf{g} = -L\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{-1}\mathbf{x}$ and the identity $\langle \mathbf{A}x, y \rangle = \langle x, \mathbf{A}^T y \rangle$, the right-hand side of (9) can be written as follows:

$$S = \frac{1}{2L} \|g_0\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\tau} \|g_N\|^2 + \left\langle \left(L\mathbf{A}^T \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{-1} + \frac{\mu L}{2(L-\mu)} \mathbf{B} \right) \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \right\rangle. \quad (11)$$

Denote the first row and the last row of $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ by \mathbf{h}_0 and \mathbf{h}_N , both written as column vectors. Then, we have

$$S = L \langle \mathbf{S}\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle, \text{ where } \mathbf{S} = \mathbf{A}^T \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{-1} + \frac{\kappa}{2(1-\kappa)} \mathbf{B} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{h}_0 \mathbf{h}_0^T - \frac{L}{2\tau} \mathbf{h}_N \mathbf{h}_N^T. \quad (12)$$

Thus, we obtained a sufficient condition for (8), stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *If there are a positive multiplier τ and a set of non-negative multipliers $\{\lambda_{i,j}\}$ such that (10) holds and that $\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{S}^T)$ is positive semi-definite, then the guarantee (8) holds.*

We refer to the symmetric matrix $\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{S}^T)$ as the *PEP matrix*. We refer to $(\tau, \{\lambda_{i,j}\})$ satisfying the conditions in Theorem 2 as a *dual feasible point*.

3 Proof of Theorem 1

To prove Theorem 1, it suffices to show

$$\frac{f_0 - f_N}{\gamma} \geq \min \{E_N(\eta), E_N(\rho)\} \frac{\|g_N\|^2}{2}, \quad (13)$$

since adding it with $\frac{f_N^+ - f_*}{\gamma} \geq 0$ yields (3) [RGP24, §4.5]. Given N , μ , and L , the optimal stepsize $\gamma^*(N, \mu, L)$ is uniquely defined as the one that optimizes the rate (13). It is known that $\gamma^*(N, \mu, L)$ is the value of γ that makes the two arguments of the min function in (13) equal, and that $E_N(\eta) < E_N(\rho)$ when $\gamma < \gamma^*(N, \mu, L)$ and $E_N(\eta) > E_N(\rho)$ when $\gamma > \gamma^*(N, \mu, L)$ [THG17; RGP24]. Our proof of Theorem 1 consists of two steps. First, we prove it for $\gamma = \gamma^*(N, \mu, L)$. Then, we extend the result to the general case where $\gamma \in (0, 2/L)$.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1 for optimal stepsize

For $\gamma = \gamma^*(N, \mu, L)$, we have $\rho, \eta \neq 0$ by Proposition 1 in the appendix. Thus, $E_k(\eta)$ and $E_k(\rho)$ are well-defined for $k = 1, \dots, N$ (see Table 1). Define two sequences $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^{N-1}$ and $\{\beta_k\}_{k=1}^{N-1}$ as follows:

$$\alpha_k = \begin{cases} \frac{T_1(\rho, \eta)}{F_{N-1}(\eta)} & \text{if } k = 1 \\ -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{T_1(\rho, \eta)}{F_{N-1}(\eta)} + \left(\frac{T_2(\rho, \eta)}{F_{N-2}(\eta)} - \frac{T_1(\rho, \eta)}{F_{N-1}(\eta)} \right) & \text{if } k = 2 \\ -\frac{1}{\rho} \left(\frac{T_{k-1}(\rho, \eta)}{F_{N-k+1}(\eta)} - \frac{T_{k-2}(\rho, \eta)}{F_{N-k+2}(\eta)} \right) + \left(\frac{T_k(\rho, \eta)}{F_{N-k}(\eta)} - \frac{T_{k-1}(\rho, \eta)}{F_{N-k+1}(\eta)} \right) & \text{if } 3 \leq k \leq N-1 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

$$\beta_k = \frac{\eta - \rho}{\eta} E_k(\rho) - \frac{T_k(\rho, \eta)}{F_{N-k}(\eta)} \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, N-1.$$

We set the multipliers as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau &= L\rho^{2N} \\
\lambda_{k,k-1} &= -\frac{\eta\rho}{(\eta-\rho)}\beta_k \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, N-1 \\
\lambda_{N,k-1} &= -\frac{\eta\rho}{(\eta-\rho)}\alpha_k \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, N-1 \\
\lambda_{k-1,k} &= 1 - \frac{\eta\rho}{(\eta-\rho)} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j + \beta_k \right) \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, N-1 \\
\lambda_{N,N-1} &= -\rho E_N(\rho) - \frac{\eta\rho}{(\eta-\rho)} \left(-\frac{T_{N-1}(\rho, \eta)}{F_1(\eta)} - \frac{1}{\rho} \left(\frac{T_{N-1}(\rho, \eta)}{F_1(\eta)} - \frac{T_{N-2}(\rho, \eta)}{F_2(\eta)} \right) \right) \\
\lambda_{N-1,N} &= \lambda_{N,N-1} + 1 - \frac{\eta\rho}{(\eta-\rho)} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \alpha_j.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

The following lemma shows that these multipliers form a dual feasible point.

Lemma 1. $(\tau, \{\lambda_{i,j}\})$ given by (15) is a dual feasible point to the PEP in Section 2 applied to GD.

The proof of Lemma 1 can be found in Appendix A. By Theorem 2, this implies the convergence guarantee $f_0 - f_N^+ \geq \frac{\rho^{2N}}{2L} \|g_N\|^2$, which is equivalent to (13). Note that the result is valid even when $\mu < 0$.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1 for any stepsize

In this subsection, we show that the result in the previous subsection leads to a complete proof of Theorem 1. We consider γ and N to be fixed, which implies that the iterates x_k are also fixed for given x_0 , while μ and L are allowed to vary.

- (i) $\gamma < \gamma^*(N, \mu, L)$. In this case, we have $E_N(1 - \gamma\mu) < E_N(1 - \gamma L)$, meaning that μ determines the rate. By the intermediate value theorem, we can choose $L' \in (L, 2/\gamma)$ such that $E_N(1 - \gamma\mu) = E_N(1 - \gamma L')$, or equivalently $\gamma = \gamma^*(N, \mu, L')$. Since L -smooth functions are L' -smooth, the convergence guarantee for (μ, L') also applies to (μ, L) .
- (ii) $\gamma > \gamma^*(N, \mu, L)$. In this case, we have $E_N(1 - \gamma\mu) > E_N(1 - \gamma L)$, meaning that L determines the rate. By the intermediate value theorem, we can choose $\mu' \in (-\infty, \mu)$ such that $E_N(1 - \gamma\mu') = E_N(1 - \gamma L)$, or equivalently $\gamma = \gamma^*(N, \mu', L)$. Since μ -strongly convex functions are μ' -strongly convex, the convergence guarantee for (μ', L) also applies to (μ, L) .

Furthermore, we can explicitly write a dual feasible point. We observe that, when p , q , and f are fixed, the inequality (6) becomes weaker as L increases or μ decreases.³ Denote the multipliers in (15) as $(\tau^{\mu,L}, \{\lambda_{i,j}^{\mu,L}\})$, showing their dependency on μ and L . For case (i), $(\tau^{\mu,L'}, \{\lambda_{i,j}^{\mu,L'}\})$ is a dual feasible point. For case (ii), $(\tau^{\mu',L}, \{\lambda_{i,j}^{\mu',L}\})$ is a dual feasible point. Applying Theorem 2 to these dual feasible points proves the first part (upper bound) of Theorem 1. Since this upper bound matches the lower bound in [RGP24, Prop. 5.2], the proof is complete.

³One can verify this by computing the partial derivatives of $Q_{i,j}$ with respect to μ and L .

A Proof of Lemma 1

We need to verify that (i) $\lambda_{i,j} \geq 0$ for all $i, j \in I$, (ii) $\{\lambda_{i,j}\}$ satisfy (10), and that (iii) the PEP matrix \mathbf{S} is positive semi-definite. Showing (ii) is straightforward. We will check (i) in Appendix A.1.1, and (iii) in Appendix A.2. The following propositions will be used.

Proposition 1 ([RGP24, Props. 2.12, 4.6]). *When $\gamma = \gamma^*(N, \mu, L)$, we have $\rho \in (-1, 0)$, $\eta \in (-\rho, \infty)$, $T_k(\rho, \eta) \geq 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, N-1$, and $T_N(\rho, \eta) = 0$.*

Proposition 2. *For any $\rho \in (-1, 0)$, $\eta \in (0, \infty)$, and $N \in (0, \infty)$, the function $\psi(t)$ given by*

$$\psi(t) = \begin{cases} \log\left(\frac{1+(1-\rho)(N+t)}{1+(1-\rho)(N-t)}\right) & \text{if } \eta = 1 \\ \log\left(\frac{-(\eta-\rho)+(\eta-\rho)\eta^{-t-N}}{-(\eta-\rho)+(\eta-\rho)\eta^{t-N}}\right) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is convex on $[0, N]$.

We omit the proof of Proposition 2 as it can be derived using elementary calculus.

A.1 Verifying non-negativity of multipliers

We only need to show that α_k , β_k , and $\lambda_{N,N-1}$ are non-negative, as all multipliers are weighted sums of these plus a non-negative constant.

A.1.1 Verifying non-negativity of α_k

The non-negativity of α_k follows from Proposition 1 and the following proposition.

Proposition 3. *The following inequality holds for $k = 1, \dots, N-2$:*

$$\frac{T_{k+1}(\rho, \eta)}{F_{N-k-1}(\eta)} - \frac{T_k(\rho, \eta)}{F_{N-k}(\eta)} \geq 0. \quad (16)$$

Proof. We consider two cases: $\eta \in (0, 1]$ and $\eta \in [1, \infty)$.

Case 1. $\eta \in (0, 1]$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_k &= \eta^{2k-2} (\eta^{-2k+1} + \eta^{-2k} - \rho^{-2k+1} - \rho^{-2k}) \\ &= (\eta^{-1} + \eta^{-2}) - \frac{\eta^{2k-2}}{\rho^{2k-2}} (\rho^{-1} + \rho^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, φ_k is non-increasing by Proposition 1, and we have

$$T_k(\rho, \eta) = \varphi_1 + \eta^{-2}\varphi_2 + \dots + \eta^{-2k+2}\varphi_k.$$

Thus, for $k = 1, \dots, N-2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= T_N(\rho, \eta) \\ &= \varphi_1 + \eta^{-2}\varphi_2 + \dots + \eta^{-2N+2}\varphi_N \\ &\leq \varphi_1 + \eta^{-2}\varphi_2 + \dots + \eta^{-2k+2}\varphi_k \\ &\quad + (\eta^{-2k} + \eta^{-2k-2} \dots + \eta^{-2N+2}) \varphi_{k+1} \\ &= T_k(\rho, \eta) + (\eta^{-2k} + \eta^{-2k-2} + \dots + \eta^{-2N+2}) \varphi_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $T_{k+1}(\rho, \eta) = T_k(\rho, \eta) + \eta^{-2k} \varphi_{k+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq T_k(\rho, \eta) + (\eta^{-2k} + \eta^{-2k-2} \dots + \eta^{-2N+2}) \eta^{2k} (T_{k+1}(\rho, \eta) - T_k(\rho, \eta)) \\ &= (1 + \eta^{-2} + \dots + \eta^{-2N+2k+2}) T_{k+1}(\rho, \eta) - (\eta^{-2} + \dots + \eta^{-2N+2k+2}) T_k(\rho, \eta) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\frac{T_{k+1}(\rho, \eta)}{T_k(\rho, \eta)} \geq \frac{\eta^{-2} + \dots + \eta^{-2N+2k+2}}{1 + \eta^{-2} + \dots + \eta^{-2N+2k+2}}$$

To prove (16), we only need to show

$$\frac{\eta^{-2} + \dots + \eta^{-2N+2k+2}}{1 + \eta^{-2} + \dots + \eta^{-2N+2k+2}} \geq \frac{\eta + \eta^2 + \dots + \eta^{N-k-1}}{\eta + \eta^2 + \dots + \eta^{N-k}}.$$

One can verify that this inequality holds for all $\eta \in (0, 1]$.

Case 2. $\eta \in [1, \infty)$. Let

$$\varphi_k = \eta^{-2k+1} + \eta^{-2k} - \rho^{-2k+1} - \rho^{-2k}.$$

By Proposition 1, φ_k is non-increasing. Following a similar argument as in Case 1, we arrive at

$$\frac{T_{k+1}(\rho, \eta)}{T_k(\rho, \eta)} \geq \frac{N - k - 1}{N - k}.$$

Thus, we only need to show

$$\frac{N - k - 1}{N - k} \geq \frac{\eta + \eta^2 + \dots + \eta^{N-k-1}}{\eta + \eta^2 + \dots + \eta^{N-k}}.$$

One can verify that this inequality holds for all $\eta \in [1, \infty)$. □

A.1.2 Verifying non-negativity of β_k

It suffices to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4. *The following inequality holds for $k = 1, \dots, N - 1$:*

$$\frac{\eta - \rho}{\eta} E_k(\rho) - \frac{T_k(\rho, \eta)}{F_{N-k}(\eta)} \geq 0. \quad (17)$$

Proof. We present the proof for the case where $\eta \neq 1$. The case where $\eta = 1$ can be handled using the same argument with the expressions $E_k(\eta) = 2k$ and $F_{N-k}(\eta) = N - k$. Substituting $T_k(\rho, \eta) = E_k(\eta) - E_k(\rho)$ and dividing both sides by $\frac{\eta - \rho}{\eta} + \frac{1}{F_{N-k}(\eta)}$, (17) can be equivalently written as follows:

$$E_k(\rho) - \frac{\eta}{(\eta - \rho)F_{N-k}(\eta) + \eta} E_k(\eta) \geq 0.$$

Using the expressions $E_k(x) = \frac{x^{-2k}-1}{1-x}$ and $F_k(x) = \frac{x(1-x^k)}{1-x}$, this inequality can be equivalently written as follows:

$$\frac{(-\rho)^{-2k} - 1}{1 - \rho} - \frac{\eta^{-2k} - 1}{(\eta - \rho)(1 - \eta^{N-k}) + (1 - \eta)} \geq 0. \quad (18)$$

Multiplying both sides by $1 - \rho$ and adding 1 to each side, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (-\rho)^{-2k} &\geq \frac{(1 - \rho)(\eta^{-2k} - 1)}{(\eta - \rho)(1 - \eta^{N-k}) + (1 - \eta)} + 1 \\ &= \frac{-(\eta - \rho) + (1 - \rho)\eta^{-k-N}}{-\eta + \rho + (1 - \rho)\eta^{k-N}}. \end{aligned}$$

By taking logarithms, we obtain

$$-2k \log(-\rho) \geq \log \left(\frac{-(\eta - \rho) + (1 - \rho)\eta^{-k-N}}{-\eta + \rho + (1 - \rho)\eta^{k-N}} \right).$$

We consider k as a real variable, and view both sides as functions of k . This inequality becomes an equality at $k = 0$ and $k = N$, as is clear from its equivalent form (18). By Proposition 2, the right-hand side is convex on $[0, N]$. Therefore, the given inequality is valid for all $k \in [0, N]$. \square

A.1.3 Verifying non-negativity of $\lambda_{N,N-1}$

We rewrite $\lambda_{N,N-1}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{N,N-1} &= -\rho E_N(\rho) + \frac{\rho}{\eta - \rho} T_{N-1}(\rho, \eta) + \frac{\eta}{(\eta - \rho)} \left(\frac{T_{N-1}(\rho, \eta)}{\eta} - \frac{T_{N-2}(\rho, \eta)}{\eta + \eta^2} \right) \\ &= -\frac{\rho\eta}{\eta - \rho} \left(\frac{\eta - \rho}{\eta} E_{N-1}(\rho) - \frac{T_{N-1}(\rho, \eta)}{F_1(\eta)} \right) + \frac{\eta}{(\eta - \rho)} \left(\frac{T_{N-1}(\rho, \eta)}{F_1(\eta)} - \frac{T_{N-2}(\rho, \eta)}{F_2(\eta)} \right) \\ &\quad - \rho (\rho^{-2N+1} + \rho^{-2N}). \end{aligned}$$

The non-negativity of $\lambda_{N,N-1}$ now follows from Propositions 1, 3, and 4.

A.2 Verifying positive semi-definiteness of PEP matrix

From $\mathbf{H} = (1 - \rho)I_N$, we can write the matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{-1}$ as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & \\ -\rho & 1 & & & \\ 0 & -\rho & 1 & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & \\ \rho & 1 & & & \\ \rho^2 & \rho & 1 & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \\ \rho^N & \rho^{N-1} & \rho^{N-2} & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

We substitute all expressions into (12), and then find a nice expression for the PEP matrix \mathbf{S} . This task is summarized in the following proposition.

Proposition 5. *The PEP matrix given by Lemma 1 can be expressed as*

$$\mathbf{S} = \frac{\eta^2(1 - \rho)}{2(\eta - \rho)^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \delta_k \mathbf{v}_k \mathbf{v}_k^T, \quad (20)$$

where the sequence $\{\delta_k\}_{k=1}^N$ is defined by

$$\delta_k = \begin{cases} T_1(\rho, \eta) & \text{if } k = 1 \\ T_k(\rho, \eta) - \frac{F_{N-k}(\eta)^2}{F_{N-k+1}(\eta)^2} T_{k-1}(\rho, \eta) & \text{if } 2 \leq k \leq N, \end{cases}$$

and the vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ are defined by

$$\mathbf{v}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ -1/F_{N-1}(\eta) \\ -1/F_{N-1}(\eta) \\ \vdots \\ -1/F_{N-1}(\eta) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{v}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ -1/F_{N-2}(\eta) \\ \vdots \\ -1/F_{N-2}(\eta) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \dots, \quad \mathbf{v}_{N-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ -1/F_1(\eta) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{v}_N = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

A MATLAB code for symbolically verifying Proposition 5 is available at

<https://github.com/jungbinkim1/GD-Exact-Rate>.

To prove the positive semi-definiteness of \mathbf{S} , we only need to show $\delta_k \geq 0$ for all k . This follows from $\frac{F_{N-k}(\eta)}{F_{N-k+1}(\eta)} \in [0, 1)$ and Propositions 1 and 3.

References

- [DT14] Yoel Drori and Marc Teboulle. “Performance of first-order methods for smooth convex minimization: a novel approach”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 145.1 (2014), pp. 451–482.
- [THG17] Adrien B Taylor, Julien M Hendrickx, and François Glineur. “Smooth strongly convex interpolation and exact worst-case performance of first-order methods”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 161 (2017), pp. 307–345.
- [Nes18] Yurii Nesterov. *Lectures on convex optimization*. Vol. 137. Springer, 2018.
- [TB19] Adrien Taylor and Francis Bach. “Stochastic first-order methods: non-asymptotic and computer-aided analyses via potential functions”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 2934–2992.
- [KF21] Donghwan Kim and Jeffrey A Fessler. “Optimizing the efficiency of first-order methods for decreasing the gradient of smooth convex functions”. In: *Journal of optimization theory and applications* 188.1 (2021), pp. 192–219.
- [RGP24] Teodor Rotaru, François Glineur, and Panagiotis Patrinos. “Exact worst-case convergence rates of gradient descent: a complete analysis for all constant stepsizes over non-convex and convex functions”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.17506* (2024).